



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,826	03/14/2000	Paul C. Tang	310265.90261	7757
26735	7590	03/21/2006	EXAMINER	
QUARLES & BRADY LLP FIRSTAR PLAZA, ONE SOUTH PINCKNEY STREET P.O BOX 2113 SUITE 600 MADISON, WI 53701-2113			GLASS, RUSSELL S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3626		

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/524,826	TANG ET AL.
	Examiner Russell S. Glass	Art Unit 3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 14-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 14-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: Examiner believes that applicant intended to have claim 16 depend upon claim 14 instead of 15. For the purpose of examination, claim 16 is considered to depend from claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. **Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

As per claims 14-18, these claims recite the newly added limitation "if the hyperlink is for an active guidelines order, sending a communication to the electronic medical software system". These claims recite a conditional limitation. There is no requirement within claims 14-18 that the limitation must occur. It is unclear to the examiner what happens when the URL router intercepts a hyperlink that is not for an active guidelines server. Applicant is requested to clarify within these claims what happens when the URL router intercepts a hyperlink that is not for an active guidelines server.

As per claims 14-18, these claims contain the generic term "codes". It is unclear to the examiner from the specification whether applicant intends to claim CPT and/or diagnostic codes or whether the applicant is claiming HTML codes corresponding to

active guideline tags associated with the active guidelines order. Applicant is requested to clarify within these claims what type of code is being claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-5, 14, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grey, (U.S. 6,149,585), in view of Preston Gralla, HOW THE INTERNET WORKS 145-57, 166-69 (Greg Weigand ed., Que Millennium) (August 1999) (“Gralla”), and further in view of Coli et al., (U.S. 6,018,713).**

4. As per claim 1, Grey discloses a computerized patient records system operated for a healthcare institution which maintains written clinical guidelines, a method of operating active guidelines comprising the steps of:

- on a guidelines server, maintaining the clinical guidelines and also maintaining, associated with the clinical guidelines, active guideline tags containing codes for actions to be taken by the computerized patient records system, (Grey, col. 2, lines 41, 42, 65; col. 5, lines 17-26);
- at the station of a user, operating an active guidelines viewer in

communication with the guidelines server, the active guidelines viewer including a web browser, (Grey, Figs, 19-22A; col.2, lines 41, 42, 65; col. 3, lines 8-11; col. 4, line 41-col. 5, line 61; col. 6, lines 50-68; col. 8, lines 23-26, lines 55-65; col. 9, line 40-col.10, lines 53-61) (disclosing a viewer and server for medical guidelines).

However, Grey fails to disclose the following well-known methods steps disclosed by Gralla:

an active guidelines interpreter (Gralla, p.145-54) (disclosing a web browser performing the function of an active guidelines interpreter by interpreting HTML tags/markups),

and a URL router, (Gralla, p.155-57) (disclosing an HTTP server performing the function of a URL router because it is interposed between the web browser of the user and the rest of the system, and allows the host to communicate with the client

i) the active guidelines interpreter receiving the active guidelines tags and converting the active guideline into a hyperlink with a uniform resource locator (URL) and passing the URL to the web browser and the URL router, (Gralla, p. 145-157) (disclosing the well known method of using an http server to send a document, including the document URL, containing tags and/or other markup language to a web browser).

ii) the web browser receiving and displaying the URL from the active guidelines interpreter to present a hyperlink for the user representing the active guideline, (Gralla, p.145-157) (disclosing the well known method of using a web browser to receive a document, including the document URL, containing tags identifying hyperlinks and/or other markup language, for display on the web browser); and

c) when the user invokes the hyperlink, the URL router intercepting the hyperlink for URL's and creating an action item from the tag to be sent to the computerized system for implementation, the action item being processed by the computerized system, (Gralla, p. 145-157) (disclosing an http server acting as a URL router to receive the URL from the system web browser when a hyperlink is activated, retrieving the document and associated format tags, and having the system web browser process the HTML file).

Gralla fails to disclose processing computerized patient records at a health care institution containing clinical guidelines. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the medical subject matter of Grey into the method disclosed by Gralla. The motivation would have been to assist a physician in accurately and efficiently diagnosing a patient, (Grey, col. 1, line 24-26, 50-54).

Gralla and Grey fail to disclose creating an order. However, using such a system to generate an order is well known in the art as evidenced by Coli et al., (Coli, col. 19, lines 54-63; col.12, lines 24-28) (disclosing a doctor activating a hyperlink associated with a desired test for a test ordering function).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the medical subject matter of Grey and Coli into the well-known method disclosed by Gralla. The motivation would have been to provide a clinical test ordering and results reporting system wherein other layers of data can be attached to the test result output, (Coli, col. 3, lines 6-10).

5. As per claim 3 and 16, Grey discloses a method wherein the order in step (c) is for a procedure to be performed, (Grey, col. 6, lines 50-60).
6. As per claim 4 and 5, Grey discloses a method wherein the station of the user communicates with the active guidelines server over the internet, (Grey, Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 37-53; col. 3, lines 24-41).
7. As per claim 14, Grey discloses a multiple server computer system to operate an electronic medical records software system and order entry in a healthcare institution, a method comprising the steps of:
 - a) providing an active guidelines server, the active guidelines server maintaining a set of clinical guidelines and a set of active guidelines tags, each of the active guidelines tags being associated with at least one of the clinical guidelines and including codes for orders to be ordered, (Grey, col. 2, lines 41, 42, 65; col. 5, lines 17-26),
 - b) providing a workstation at the location of a clinician, the workstation operating an active guidelines viewer, the active guidelines viewer including a web browser, (Grey, Figs. 19-22A; col. 2, lines 41, 42, 65; col. 3, lines 8-11; col. 4, line 41- col. 5, line 61; col. 6, lines 50-68; col. 8, lines 23-26, lines 55-65; col. 9, line 40-col. 10, lines 53-61) (disclosing a viewer and server for medical guidelines).

However, Grey fails to disclose the following well-known method steps:

an interpreter and a URL router, the interpreter converting the document tags into a hyperlink with a uniform resource locator (URL), the web browser displaying for the user the hyperlink associated with the document, (Gralla, p. 145-157) (disclosing the well known method of using an http server to send a document, including the document URL, containing tags and/or other markup language to a web browser, and also using a web browser to receive a document, including the document URL, containing tags identifying hyperlinks and/or other markup language, for display on the web browser); and

c) when the user chooses a hyperlink presented by the web browser, the URL router intercepting the hyperlink and sending a communication to the electronic medical records software system, (Gralla, p. 145-157) (disclosing an http server acting as a URL router to receive the URL from the system web browser when a hyperlink is activated, retrieving the document and associated format tags, and having the system web browser process the HTML file).

Gralla fails to disclose processing computerized patient records at a health care institution containing clinical guidelines. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the medical subject matter and clinical context of Grey into the method disclosed by Gralla, (i.e. a clinician in lieu of a user, a clinical guideline in lieu of a document, etc). The motivation would have been to assist a physician in accurately and efficiently diagnosing a patient, (Grey, col. 1, line 24-26, 50-54).

Gralla and Grey fail to disclose creating an order. However, using such a system to generate an order is well known in the art as evidenced by Coli et al., (Coli, col. 19, lines 54-63; col.12, lines 24-28) (disclosing a doctor activating a hyperlink associated with a desired test for a test ordering function).

8. As per claim 17, claim 17 contains the same or similar limitations as claim 14 except the following well-known methods steps further disclosed by Coli:
 - a) including codes for orders to be implemented by an electronic medical records system, (Coli, Fig. 7; col. 3, line43-col. 4, line 2; col. 4, line 62-col. 5, line 57; col. 11, line 55-col. 12, line 38; col. 12, line 62-col. 13, line 29; col. 16, lines 56-67) ,
 - b) storing the codes for orders and providing input to and monitoring output of the web browser, (Coli, Fig. 7; col. 3, line43-col. 4, line 2; col. 4, line 62-col. 5, line 57; col. 11, line 55-col. 12, line 38; col. 12, line 62-col. 13, line 29; col. 16, lines 56-67), and
 - c) sending a communication to the electronic medical records software system containing the stored order to cause an order to be entered, (Coli, Fig. 7; col. 3, line43-col. 4, line 2; col. 4, line 62-col. 5, line 57; col. 11, line 55-col. 12, line 38; col. 12, line 62-col. 13, line 29; col. 16, lines 56-67).

9. The method of claim 17 wherein the sending of the communication to the electronic medical records software system includes sending the communication to an accumulator which accumulates communications for delivery to the electronic medical records software system, (Coli et al., Figs. 4-10; col. 3, line43-col. 4, line 2; col. 4, line

62-col. 5, line 57; col. 11, line 55-col. 12, line 38; col. 12, line 62-col. 13, line 29; col. 16, lines 56-67) (disclosing a Diagnostic Information System that accumulates communications for delivery, such as orders, see in particular Fig. 9 showing accumulated orders after delivery to the system).

10. **Claims 2, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grey, (U.S. 6,149,585), in view of Preston Gralla, How THE INTERNET WORKS 145-57, 166-69 (Greg Weigand ed., Que Millennium) (August 1999) (“Gralla”), and further in view of Coli et al., (U.S. 6,018,713), and further in view of DeLaHeurga, (U.S. 6,408,330).**

11. As per claim 2 and 15, The collective system of Grey, Gralla, and Coli fails to disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the order in step (c) is issuing a prescription. However, issuing a prescription using a method similar to that disclosed by the collective system above is well-known in the art as evidenced by DeLaHeurga, (DeLaHeurga, Figs. 13A-C, 14A and B, 30; col. 16, lines 27-44; col. 36, line 23-col. 37, line 42; coll 52, line 49-col. 53, line 19; col. 54, line 65-col. 55, line 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the prescription ordering system in DeLaheurga in to the collective system of Grey, Gralla, and Coli. The motivation would have been to reduce the

amount of manual data entry and simplify information management, (DeLaHeurga, col. 9, lines 55-56).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 14-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell S. Glass whose telephone number is 571-272-3132. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RSG
3/07/06

756


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER